



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address; COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/014,501	12/14/2001	Gennady V. Merkulov	CL00001177DIV2	3922
25748 7	590 03/03/2004		EXAM	INER
CELERA GENOMICS CORP. ATTN: WAYNE MONTGOMERY, VICE PRES, INTEL PROPERTY 45 WEST GUDE DRIVE C2-4#20			FRONDA, CHRISTIAN L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	
ROCKVILLE,	MD 20850		DATE MAILED: 03/03/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/014,501	MERKULOV ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christian L Fronda	1652
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period value of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a re y within the statutory minimum of thirty vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT , cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. (HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 4,8,9 and 24-37 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 4,8,9 and 24-37 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2001 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the	wn from consideration. r election requirement. r. re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	= -	• • •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Aprity documents have been rule (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage
Attachmant(a)	,	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/11/02.	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/014,501 Page 2

Art Unit: 1652

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

- 1. Applicants' election of Group II, claims 4, 5, 8-11, 22, and 23 in the **RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION AND PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT** dated 12/15/2003 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
- 2. Applicants cancellation of claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-23, and addition of 24-37 is acknowledged.
- 3. Claims 4, 8, 9, and 24-37 are under consideration in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

- 4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

 Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
- 5. Claims 4, 8, 9, and 24-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible asserted utility or a well established utility.

Applicants disclose the nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1 and 3, the deduced amino acid sequence of the protein encoded as SEQ ID NO: 2, and assigned the protein of SEQ ID NO: 2 as a human metalloprotease protein which is a generic asserted utility. However, the specification does not disclose the specific function of the protein of SEQ ID NO: 2 or its specific relationship to any disease. Homology is not a disclosure of how to use the protein or polynucleotide encoding the protein of SEQ ID NO: 2. While the claimed invention can be used in gene and protein expression monitoring experimentations, the specification does not teach any meaningful interpretation of data collected from such experimentations. Nor does the specification teach how to use any identified compound which modulates the expression of the claimed invention.

Substantial utility is one that provides a specific benefit in currently available form at the time of filing of the invention. However, the main utility of the nucleic acid and protein is to carry out further research to identify the biological function and possible diseases associated with the protein. Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or

Art Unit: 1652

reasonably confirm a specific use are not substantial utility and do not provide a specific benefit. Thus, the claimed invention has no specific or substantial asserted utility.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph

- 6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 7. Claims 4, 8, 9, and 24-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above in the rejection of claims 4, 8, 9, and 24-37 under 35 U.S.C. 101, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.
- 8. Claims 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 31-37 are genus claims that are directed toward all possible polynucleotides having at least 90% homology to SEQ ID NOs: 1 or 3. The scope of the claim includes many polynucleotides with widely differing structural, chemical, and physical characteristics, and the genus is highly variable because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted.

The specification, however, only provides the following representative species encompassed by these claims: a polynucleotide having a nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1 or SEQ ID NO: 3. There is no disclosure of any particular structure to function/activity relationship in the single disclosed species. The specification also fails to describe additional representative species of these polynucleotides by any identifying structural characteristics or properties for which no predictability of structure is apparent.

Given this lack of additional representative species as encompassed by the claims, Applicants have failed to sufficiently describe the claimed invention, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms that a skilled artisan would recognize Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention. Claims 32-37 which depend from claim 32 are also rejected because they do

Art Unit: 1652

not correct the defect of claim 32.

9. Claim 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized In re Wands [858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ 2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988)]. The Wands factors are: (a) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (b) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (c) the presence or absence of working example, (d) the nature of the invention, (e) the state of the prior art, (f) the relative skill of those in the art, (g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (h) the breadth of the claim.

The nature and breadth of the claims encompass any polynucleotides having at least 90% homology to SEQ ID NOs: 1 or 3 of any biological function and biological utility.

The specification provides guidance and examples for making an isolated polynucleotide having a nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1 or SEQ ID NO: 3. However, the specification does not teach the specific structural/catalytic amino acids and the structural motifs essential for protease activity/function which cannot be altered. The state of the art as exemplified by Attwood et al. (Comput. Chem. 2001, Vol. 25(4), pp. 329-39) is such that "...we do not fully understand the rules of protein folding, so we cannot predict protein structure; and we cannot invariably diagnose protein function, given knowledge only of its sequence or structure in isolation" (see Abstract and entire publication). Furthermore, Ponting (Brief. Bioinform. March 2001, Vol. 2(1), pp. 19-29) states that "...predicting function by homology is a qualitative, rather than quantitative, process and requires particular care to be taken...due attention should be paid to all available clues to function, including orthologue identification, conservation of particular residue types, and the co-occurrence of domains in proteins" (See Abstract and entire publication).

The standard for meeting the enablement requirement is whether one of skill in the art can make the invention without undue experimentation. The amount of experimentation to make the claimed polynucleotide is enormous and entails selecting specific nucleotides to change (deletion, insertion, substitution, or combinations thereof) in a polynucleotide to make a polynucleotide that has at least 90% homology to SEQ ID NOs: 1 or 3 and determining by assays whether the polypeptide has an protease activity. The specification does not provide guidance with respect to the specific structural/catalytic amino acids and the structural motifs essential for enzyme structure and activity/function which must be preserved. Thus, searching for the specific nucleotides to change (deletion, insertion, substitution, or combinations thereof) in a polynucleotide to make a polynucleotide has at least 90% homology to SEQ ID NOs: 1 or 3 is well outside the realm of routine experimentation and predictability in the art of success in

Application/Control Number: 10/014,501 Page 5

Art Unit: 1652

determining whether the resulting polypeptide has protease activity is extremely low since no information is provided by the specification regarding the specific catalytic amino acids and the structural motifs essential for enzyme structure and activity/function which must be preserved.

The Examiner finds that one skilled in the art would require additional guidance, such as information regarding the specific catalytic amino acids and the structural motifs essential for activity/function which must be preserved. Without such a guidance, the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is undue. Claims 32-37 which depend from claim 32 are also rejected because they do not correct the defect of claim 32.

Conclusion

- 10. No claim is allowed.
- 11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian L Fronda whose telephone number is (571)272-0929. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday between 9:00AM 5:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapura N Achutamurthy can be reached on (571)272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRIMARY EXAMINER

CLF